

AT



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/234,028	01/20/1999	RONALD T. RAINES	960296.95360	6579
26734	7590	01/19/2006	EXAMINER	
QUARLES & BRADY LLP FIRSTAR PLAZA, ONE SOUTH PINCKNEY STREET P.O. BOX 2113 SUITE 600 MADISON, WI 53701-2113			HUTSON, RICHARD G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/234,028

Applicant(s)

RAINES, RONALD T.

Examiner

Richard G. Hutson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,10 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,10 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants cancellation of claims 8 and 11-14 and the amendment of claims 1, 9 and 15, in the paper of 10/28/2005, is acknowledged. Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 15 are at issue and are present for examination.

Applicants' arguments filed on 10/28/2005, have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome some of the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites "ribonuclease inhibitor variant for a ribonuclease inhibitor..." It is suggested that this be amended such as "ribonuclease inhibitor variant of a ribonuclease inhibitor..."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as

to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This rejection was stated in the previous office action as it applied to claims previous claims 1-10 and 15. In response to the previous rejection, applicants have canceled claim 8 and amended claims 1, 9 and 15 and traverse the rejection in combination with the rejection based on a lack of enablement below, as it applies to the newly amended claims.

Applicants traverse this rejection on the basis that they have made changes to the claim that make it clear that what is claimed is a substituted or modified protein, and that some of the claims are limited to the human protein, although claim 1 is not limited in this way. Applicants argue that they have demonstrated that these specifically claimed targeted substitutions to the ribonuclease inhibitor result in a protein that is oxidation resistant and applicants believe that they should not be limited to such in the human form alone. Finally, applicants submit that the claimed invention involves targeted substitution to a specific category of cysteine residues, those adjacent to other cysteine residues and applicants submit that claim 1 has been amended so that it does not read on a ribonuclease inhibitor from a species which does not have the paired cysteine residues.

Applicants complete argument is acknowledged and has been carefully considered, however, continues to be found non-persuasive. Applicants arguments continue to be along the same principal of reason. Applicants referred to changes to the claim continue to be directed to the "means by which" the final product is obtained,

rather than to the actual final claimed product (i.e. the ribonuclease inhibitor variant or mutant). As these means or processes do not place limitations on the final claimed product, applicants have not thus limited the scope of the claimed product and the scope of the claimed product continues to not be adequately described for the reasons previously stated.

With respect to written description, applicants are reminded that while applicants specification provides two examples of ribonuclease inhibitors that could possibly be mutated as required by the claims, two species is not sufficient to adequately describe the genus of claims which includes any and all such ribonuclease inhibitors. The specification also fails to describe additional representative species of these mutant ribonuclease inhibitors by sufficient **structural characteristics** or properties other than the activities recited in claim 1 and the disclosed cysteine modifications, for which no predictability of structure is apparent. Given this lack of additional representative species as encompassed by the claims, Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is referred to the revised guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at www.uspto.gov.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a mutant ribonuclease inhibitor

Art Unit: 1652

comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3, wherein said mutation is a substitution in one of its two adjacent cysteine residues to an amino acid residue not capable of forming a disulfide bond, the mutant ribonuclease inhibitor having a greater resistance to oxidation, the mutant ribonuclease inhibitor retaining its specificity and binding affinity to ribonuclease, does not reasonably provide enablement for any variant ribonuclease inhibitor having at least one amino acid substitution in at least one of its adjacent cysteine residues to an amino acid residue not capable of forming a disulfide bond, the mutant ribonuclease inhibitor having a greater resistance to oxidation, the mutant ribonuclease inhibitor retaining its specificity and binding affinity to ribonuclease. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

This rejection was stated in the previous office action as it applied to claims previous claims 1-10 and 15. In response to the previous rejection, applicants have canceled claim 8 and amended claims 1, 9 and 15 and traverse the rejection in combination with the rejection based on a lack of written description above, as it applies to the newly amended claims.

Applicants traverse this rejection on the basis that they have made changes to the claim that make it clear that what is claimed is a substituted or modified protein, and that some of the claims are limited to the human protein, although claim 1 is not limited in this way. Applicants argue that they have demonstrated that these specifically claimed targeted substitutions to the ribonuclease inhibitor result in a protein that is

oxidation resistant and applicants believe that they should not be limited to such in the human form alone. Finally, applicants submit that the claimed invention involves targeted substitution to a specific category of cysteine residues, those adjacent to other cysteine residues and applicants submit that claim 1 has been amended so that it does not read on a ribonuclease inhibitor from a species which does not have the paired cysteine residues.

Applicants complete argument is acknowledged and has been carefully considered, however, continues to be found non-persuasive. Applicants arguments continue to be along the same principal of reason. Applicants referred to changes to the claim continue to be directed to the "means by which" the final product is obtained, rather than to the actual final claimed product (i.e. the ribonuclease inhibitor variant or mutant). As these means or processes do not place limitations on the final claimed product, applicants have not thus limited the scope of the claimed product and the scope of the claimed product continues to not be enabled for the reasons previously stated.

With respect to the enablement of the claimed genus, applicants specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments of any mutant ribonuclease which **does not** comprise said cysteine mutations because the specification does **not** establish: (A) regions of the protein structure which may be modified without effecting ribonuclease inhibitor activity and oxidative resistance; (B) the general tolerance of ribonuclease to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable scheme for modifying any amino

Art Unit: 1652

acid residues with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function; and (D) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including any number of amino acid modifications of any ribonuclease inhibitor. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (In re Fisher, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of those mutants having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blazquez et al. (Journal of Biological Chemistry, Vol 271, pp 18638-18642, 1996).

This rejection was stated in the previous office action as it applied to claims previous claims 1-10 and 15. In response to the previous rejection, applicants have canceled claim 8 and amended claims 1, 9 and 15 and traverse the rejection as it applies to the newly amended claims.

For applicants convenience, the original rejection is repeated here. Blazquez et al. teach a ribonuclease inhibitor which meets all of the structural limitations of the rejected claims and thus anticipates the claims. The ribonuclease inhibitor taught by Blazquez et al. is a "mutant human ribonuclease" having at least one amino acid substitution in at least one of two adjacent cysteine residues present in the amino acid sequence of the wild-type human ribonuclease inhibitor, the substitution being to an amino acid not capable of forming a disulfide bond with an adjacent residue. A greater resistance to oxidation (than the human ribonuclease inhibitor) and the specificity and binding affinity to ribonuclease are inherent properties of the ribonuclease inhibitor taught by Blazquez et al.

While the reference does not specifically disclose that the ribonuclease inhibitor has a greater resistance to oxidation (than the human ribonuclease inhibitor). Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' protein with the protein of the prior art, the burden is on applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 205 USPQ 594.

Applicants state that they disagree with the examiner as to what Blazquez et al. teaches. Applicants state that they believe that the previous and above statements that Blazquez et al. teaches a ribonuclease inhibitor which meets the structural limitations of the claims are incorrect. Applicants then characterize what they believe Blazquez et al. teaches followed by applicants submission that Blazquez et al. does not teach nor suggest a modified amino acid sequence of a ribonuclease inhibitor.

Applicants complete argument is acknowledged and has been carefully considered, however, continues to be found nonpersuasive on the the basis that as previously stated "the ribonuclease inhibitor" taught by Blazquez et al. meets all of the structural limitations of the claimed ribonuclease inhibitor.

Blazquez et al. teach the porcine ribonuclease inhibitor, which meets all of the structural limitations of the claimed ribonuclease inhibitor variant or mutant. The porcine ribonuclease inhibitor inherently meets all of the amino acid structural requirements of the claimed ribonuclease inhibitor. If layed side by side, the porcine ribonuclease inhibitor would be structurally identical to that "ribonuclease inhibitor" claimed by applicants and thus it would inherently also maintain all of the functional characteristics associated with such a structurally identical ribonuclease inhibitor.

While the reference does not specifically disclose the ribonuclease inhibitor produced by an engineered process (as recited by the claims), the production of a protein by a particular process does not impart novelty or unobviousness to a protein when the same protein is taught by the prior art. This is particularly true when the properties of the protein are not changed by the process in an unexpected manner.

See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983); *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972). Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' protein with the protein of the prior art, the burden is on applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 205 USPQ 594.

Thus claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 15 remain anticipated by Blazquez et al.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G. Hutson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0930. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am to 4:00 pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard G. Hutson', with a stylized, overlapping flourish at the end.

Richard G Hutson, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1652